

But when we have an administration like the current one that, basically, despite saying they have secured the border, the border is not secure. People are flooding in.

And we don't fear having minorities be the majority. What some of us are concerned about is people flooding in, out of control, that have not been educated in what it takes to sustain a republic; because I have heard this from other leaders in what we consider free countries around the world, and they are getting scared.

They see what is happening in America. They say, don't you understand, when you lose your freedom in America, there will be no more freedom in the world.

This week, Ronald Reagan has been quoted a number of times, and the Prime Minister mentioned as well, that freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.

But for America to lose our freedom, which is what is in the process of happening when you take more and more right of the American people and give it to the Federal Government, and you give more and more right to the Department of Justice and Intelligence to spy on the American people, and you have an Attorney General who seizes more and more power, and says we are going to start spying on people that raise questions at school board meetings, you are jeopardizing self-government.

And to even think about creating a disinformation board that truly was—oh, it has been put on pause—a ministry of truth? The government gets to tell you what you can believe and not believe? Might as well just start calling us the Soviet Union. Good grief.

I can't believe how close we have come to what George Orwell, using his pen name, described in 1984. As I have said before, it is appearing that the main thing he got wrong was the year. It wasn't 1984, it is now.

But people have got to wake up. And for those—and I have heard it around, everywhere I go, including the airport here, the airport in Texas, you have got to do something about the price of gasoline, the price of diesel. It is making everything go up. I don't have money to fill my tanks.

Well, who caused that? The Biden administration. Who caused the shortage of formula? The Biden administration.

And we already got a question from a TV station back in Tyler, Channel 19, they always try to pick things apart.

Well, I didn't vote for this new bill that is supposed to fix baby formula. Well, I can tell you, giving millions of dollars to the FDA or the Biden administration is not going to produce one drop of baby formula. And, in fact, if they were going to be the ones to fix things, they would never have allowed us to get to this point.

But what happened? Without any regard for what would happen, they went after the Abbott facility, and it turns out, none of the formula was found to

have been contaminated. Yet, they created this shortage.

And now, this administration thinks the solution is more government, more money to the government. If we could just get more money, more people employed in the government, we can fix anything. No, that is why we have a shortage, because government is not the answer. Government is not the answer to getting cheaper gasoline prices and diesel prices and stopping inflation.

Government, right now, is creating, has been creating inflation. It is time to allow the incredible economy that wants to grow and wants to be a pie that is not a zero pie, where everybody just gets smaller shares. No, it grows. We get a bigger pie.

And nobody explains the economy and what can help fix things in this body better than my friend from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### HEALTHCARE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I try to come behind the mike at least every week when we are here, and the last few times I have been rather cranky. I am intensely frustrated with the policies of the majority.

The majority, the Democrats, the left, have controlled this place now for what, 15 months. Poor people are poorer. Working poor are poorer. The middle class is poorer. And there is just this frustration for people like myself; we have got to stop it. Stop hurting people.

And a couple of the responses to the YouTube video that went out on one of the previous floor speeches was, okay, just give us something optimistic. So let's try to do something optimistic today.

But understand, this optimism requires this body to think differently, particularly my brothers and sisters in the majority. On occasion, you are going to have to back away from who writes checks, you know, and start to think about what the future would look like if we would just even fixate, focus, consider, listen to, some of these ideas.

□ 1315

This is the first one. I have been to the floor multiple times on this. I am not going to even start with the debt chart, which used to be a tradition. But

I would often stand here with this chart and say: Hey, you do realize in the next 29 years, we are functionally heading to—what is it—\$112 trillion or \$115 trillion of borrowed money in today's dollars.

The thing we are terrified to tell the American people is that 75 percent of that is functionally Medicare and the other 25 percent is the shortfall in Social Security. It is demographics. But when you break it apart, that \$80 trillion-plus of borrowing, that is in today's dollars, that is the shortfall in Medicare. Thirty-one percent of that is just diabetes. Thirty-three percent of all healthcare spending in the United States is diabetes.

If you want to lower the cost of healthcare, if you want to make healthcare more available and accessible, you have got to stop doing what this place has been doing for a couple decades now where we play the game on who pays and who gets subsidized. Obamacare, the ACA, was about who gets subsidized and who has to pay. The Republican alternative had some of the same sin, and heaven knows, Medicare for all is purely a financing scam. It isn't about what we pay.

So let's actually do some things that are hopeful.

We have been tracking the theory behind this for a couple years now. It is functionally replacing insulin-producing cells. I did a whole presentation on how they take stem cells and convert them and tap them with a CRISPR so your body doesn't want to reject them. But the fact of the matter is, we have now had a couple people who have been cured of type 1 diabetes.

Now, it is a proof-of-concept study. They have begun phase 1. Right now, the FDA has them on a pause as they are working out dosing. But the fact of the matter is, we are that close, conceptually, to a cure for type 1. And the fact of the matter is, the premise works for type 2, but you have got to deal with some of the ancillaries, which are really uncomfortable conversations.

I represent, we believe, the population with the second-highest diabetic population in the world, one of my Tribal communities. Mr. Speaker, and many of the others here, we may have urban populations that have diabetic populations, like our rural poor.

The fact of the matter is, wouldn't it be amazing if Republicans and Democrats in this place were fixating on this concept of, we are going to fixate on curing the misery; we are not going to go out and build a bunch more clinics and say we care, so live with your misery. The concept that there is a chance that if we put our resources in the right place, just like Operation Warp Speed did—remember how many people here said you can't do that in a year, but they did it. Then we could actually have the more difficult debate here about if this is a cure for type 1, how do you move into type 2, what do you do for lifestyle, health, and what we eat.

There is some data out there we have been working on that shows one of the key contributors to income inequality in our society is the fact that family members are suffering. They are having their toes cut off. It is health. So we hear speech after speech after speech after speech here about income inequality, the poor, the poor, but how about embracing technology and taking a run at it. Yes, there is a chance it doesn't work, but we are talking trillions and trillions of spending in our near future just on diabetes. Isn't it worth investing and ending the misery?

There is hope that that is actually something that would be honorable and noble and compassionate and moral. But it doesn't fit the playbook here because that isn't the people showing up here writing you a check.

A point of reference we have got to get through our heads: Five percent of our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions, often multiple chronic conditions, are the majority of healthcare spending. So if 5 percent is functionally 50 percent of all the spending, what happens if you help cure some of those chronic conditions? If you want to have an impact on the cost of healthcare, stop thinking of it as a financing problem; think of it as a cures issue.

I will argue, this is optimistic. It is hopeful. We are in a time of technology miracles. When is the last time you had anyone, particularly from the majority, talk about something that was optimistic, that could make the poor less poor, make society healthier, provide an opportunity that didn't also require government running our lives? In many ways, this does just the opposite. It sets us free.

This isn't pie in the sky. Some of this is happening around us. I mean, this week—I should have brought the picture—but the FDA approved a home COVID test that does more than COVID. It actually also detects flu and RSV. It is a home test, and it has been approved. So this isn't utopian; it exists.

The other thing that becomes a more difficult conversation is: If we care about people and we care about freedom and we care about crashing the price of healthcare, why not legalize technology?

So I just sort of show this as—in some ways this is as much about the picture to get the concept. Let me tell the story first. A few years ago, I was reading some of the crazy blogs and research stuff. I sit on an airplane 10 hours a week. There is a story about this material science professor who has built this thing that you blow into and pretty instantly it tells you if you have a virus, it can figure out sort of the category of the virus, and then turns around and can ping off your medical records on your phone. Theoretically, it could actually order your antivirals.

The newer generations are doing much more than just the category of virus. They are picking up bacteria.

There is even one out there that the researchers say can pick up a number of dead cancer proteins, because when a cancer cell dies, it throws off that dead DNA strip. It is functionally a flu kazoo. I thought you would like that name.

What is the problem with that technology? In this place, it is illegal. You would have an algorithm writing a prescription. You would have a pharmacist filling prescription. The Social Security Act says you will see a doctor, not an algorithm, not something you can have in your home medicine cabinet that you can blow into.

But do we actually care about people, or do we care about the people lining up at our offices who want to slow down the technology? Think of the lobbying that goes on in this place to stop telehealth.

The fact of the matter is, I have done telehealth here for a dozen years. The number of times my office was full of people saying we really like the technology, but we need to slow it down; we don't think you have enough cost controls. They will do anything because it changes the economics of delivering healthcare.

The pandemic hit, and to the majority's credit, a piece of legislation I had worked on for years, they grabbed that language and plugged it in. That is our telehealth expansion we have today.

You do realize, it goes away. The expansion on telehealth goes away when the pandemic is declared over. There are people lobbying on Capitol Hill to make sure that happens.

So we talk about how much we care, but the fact of the matter is, opportunities, technologies, the ability to use this to stay healthy, if it is not making certain people money, they are here on this campus trying to lobby against it.

You start to realize, this isn't utopian. The technology exists. When you have a breath biopsy that you can blow into that instantly can tell you if you have COVID, why doesn't this place look forward? Because so much of the policy we debate here, it is as if we are talking about the 1990s.

The fact of the matter is, there is investment coming in. This is another breath biopsy and the things you can wear that someone like myself—I have hypertension. You wear the thing on your wrist, and it helps you manage it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the simplest things—and it is not even thought experiment—16 percent of all of U.S. healthcare spending is functionally related to people not taking their medicines. So if you have hypertension, do you take your hypertension medicine. If you have high cholesterol, do you take your statins, the things that keep you from having a stroke.

A pill bottle lid that just beeps at you when you forgot to take your medicine in the morning or the things that drops the pills for grandma to stay healthy, the model says it is \$550 billion. So 16 percent of healthcare spending, \$550 billion a year. So more than

half a trillion dollars a year if you just use something as simple as a pill bottle lid that reminded you to take your medicines.

I know that is a little utopian, and it wouldn't be the completion adoption. But it is the concept. There are solutions around here that exist. We are just incapable of discussing them because they don't fit sort of the blinded, narrow vision, because we had our talking points from our political campaigns a decade ago and we haven't read a damn article since then.

So my fixation on telehealth is how about people in areas like my Navajo Nation that doesn't have WiFi. Well, the fact of the matter is, you are seeing it in Ukraine right now, aren't you? When you have satellite broadband that is available to functionally everywhere in North America right now, wouldn't it be cheaper, more efficient, and actually forward-looking to say maybe the solution for the family that is in the middle of rural America, give them the plate-shaped satellite dish and, boom, they have WiFi, they have broadband? It makes them available to use telehealth. Wouldn't that be something.

Instead, are we going to subsidize billions and billions and billions of dollars to run a strip of fiber out there, which we have been doing for decades. It is time we actually sort of entered this century.

Then there are other things that just drive me nuts. How much discussion have you had from the White House, from the Democrat leadership here, about supply chains; much of inflation isn't their fault; it is not their spending; it is not their regulatory process; it is not the changing capital stack; restricting access to hydrocarbons. It is not their fault; it is not their policies; it is shipping.

But then they do brilliant things like this, where they actually have—in their Build Back Better legislation, they slipped a sentence in there saying you don't get to automate the ports. So think about how insane this is.

The giveaway to the longshoreman union was so important to the Democrats that they will give speeches about how we need to fix the supply chain, we need to get the goods moving, but we are going to make sure that you can't do it through automation. It is in their legislation.

Do we have a vision of what the future can be where it is more productive, more prosperous, more hopeful, more opportunity for everyone, or does our majority here of Democrats continue to slip little things like this in that basically calcify the misery that is in our communities right now?

Why this slide is important is that if we are forward-looking—I just came across this, and it is the thought experiment. So a couple of SpaceX engineers have a company, and they are working, apparently, with the rail community—and I know this picture isn't great. It is little autonomous electric platforms.

You would pull a container off and put it right on the platform, and that container drives to where it is supposed to go. It is a little spur crossing. It is going to Arizona storage if it is leaving the Port of Long Beach through the port of the Alameda corridor that is all backed up, for those of us who lean a little more toward the west. But it is a technology solution.

Instead of this place holding hearings and saying, What the regulatory barriers are? What the labor regulatory barriers? There is an optimistic solution. This place will run away from it, because one of the union groups doesn't like it. It becomes about power and money; not what is actually good for the American people. But there are solutions like this of autonomous railcars.

□ 1330

This one has been out for a few years, and they are working on it. It is actually making amazing progress. You are hearing the discussions right now of food insecurity around the world. I believe it is mostly University of Illinois that has been doing this amazing work on how to get plant productivity dramatically better.

I have done whole presentations here on the floor about C4 plants, C3 plants, and how you tweak them. Remember, God made the plants so sometimes they grab an oxygen molecule. They really wanted the carbon molecule.

I apologize for the folks trying to take this down. Wave at me if I am talking too fast. I have had a lot of coffee, which is a typical day.

The optimism of what would this mean to feeding the world? What would this mean to inflation? What would this mean just for the morality of there being the efficiency—if you need less fuel, water, fertilizer, if the technology is real. In the early reports, it is pretty darn impressive.

We are holding hearings on this, right? We are having discussions of how this would be amazing to help the world grow more food and protect the environment? Of course not. Because there is no one showing up with a check to talk about this.

The next one I am going to show you is just my fixation. You do realize in the last decade, the United States has removed so much baseload nuclear power that its functioning equals every bit of renewable that has hit the grid.

On one hand, here we have this optimism. Think about all the photovoltaic and wind. Isn't this exciting? Oh, by the way, we removed so much baseload nuclear power, we haven't gone anywhere.

I know there is a huge cadre of my colleagues here that despise nuclear power. You have a Nobel Prize physicist saying, hey, we think there is actually a way you could use a high-pulse laser to break nuclear materials down. You have other people reporting that, saying we need to be taking the spent nuclear and refining it because our nu-

clear stocks have crashed. There is a long history to that, post-Cold War, lots of weapons grade. We have been knocking it down to use in other uses, and now that stockpile is running out.

But why wouldn't you invite this physicist here to Capitol Hill and say: What would it take investment-wise, timewise, to have a way to break down nuclear waste? Remember, he is the guy with the Nobel Prize; this place isn't. This is optimism. This is hope.

Then you have other things. I remember talking about this technology as a kid of how you could build batteries. We used to refer to them as a rust battery. It is a closed loop. They are very heavy. They only work in utility grade. You couldn't have them in your car. But they don't use rare earths. Why aren't these people here on Capitol Hill talking to us about how we could fix our power storage situation, particularly for those of us in the West where, during the afternoon, we have all this photovoltaic coming in, but then the Sun goes down, and we are still running our air-conditioning, and we have this crash?

There is hope. There are opportunities. Do all these work? I don't know. But that is what this body is supposed to be about: What does the future look like? Instead, we are litigating ideas that are 20 years out of date.

This one is out there right now, I guess near Houston, where they have a gas-fired power plant. I believe it is called the Allam-Fetvedt Cycle, and it has no smokestacks. They basically use the throw-off to spin.

So you burn, you spin. Instead of boiling water and having the steam spin it, it is the burn that spins the turbines, and then they capture all the CO<sub>2</sub> and save it and use it for other sources. There is no smokestack.

This is up and running today. Yes, it has had some engineering problems, but the concept, why don't we talk about this? If you say you care about greenhouse gases, and we care about the fact that much of America may have brownouts, blackouts, powerwise in the United States this year, there is a way the technology is the solution.

This last one I am going to do just because it is the quintessential that sometimes there is a solution, but no one has figured out really how to make a bunch of money on it, so no one here is ever going to talk about it.

A number of my brothers and sisters on the left despise natural gas. I am fascinated with it because you do realize a couple of years ago the expansion of fracking and natural gas got us within a couple hairs of actually the Paris accords without us even being part of the Paris accord agreement, and it was because of natural gas.

My brothers and sisters on the left who despise natural gas give the excuse of: Well, there is methane. There is methane leakage, and methane is like nine to one in global warming counts even though its half-life is disputed a bit.

If we had a way to deal with the methane bleed, would my Democratic colleagues let us let Wall Street, let pension plans, everyone else finally go back to investing in natural gas?

Well, there is some research out there that said: Hey, did you know that if you can take kitty litter, clay, I think they tag it with some copper oxide, it becomes a methane sponge, and it is really, really cheap? It is, functionally, clay.

Why wouldn't we have a hearing about this and have a discussion saying: You are saying we could go back to extracting lots of natural gas? Because the price is off the charts. Why this is so important is do not let someone lie to you and say: Well, the reason your gas prices, the reason the natural gas prices, are so high is Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

The futures market last September, October was telling us that fuel prices were about to go off the charts. It had already begun. It was substantially because of the cancelation of the pipelines, the permits, and the capital stack, the threat that the Securities and Exchange Commission was going to require all sorts of disclosures. The fact of the matter is, this majority became very hostile to hydrocarbons. It was already coming. The Russian invasion just made some of these prices that you are going to suffer through this summer happen earlier.

Part of the excuse is, well, natural gas, yes, it is half the environmental load of maybe coal. But they still hate it because of that methane.

How about if I came to you and said: It doesn't cure all the problems, but it would cure part of it? There is a solution.

Mr. Speaker, my last comment, this place has been miserable for the last 15 months. It has been dour; it has been angry; it has been sad. Wouldn't it be interesting if somewhere in here our colleagues on the left and the right just held a few hearings and said what does the future look like for technology disruption that is good for poor people, that is good for the working poor, good for the middle class? Instead, it is sort of this march toward "screw them, let them suffer" because our ideology is more important than what is really going on.

Both parties here deserve to be judged by not our words, not our virtue signaling, but what we actually accomplish. Take a look at what we did when we had the full majority. Take a look at the economy in 2018, 2019, first quarter of 2020 because we fully intend to judge you for what you did these 2 years.

The fact of the matter is, income inequality, food insecurity, the poor, the middle class all had a hell of a lot better economy and better life during our years than yours.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3525. An Act to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7691. An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2490. An Act to establish the Blackwell School National Historic Site in Marfa, Texas, and for other purposes.

## TAKE A STAND AGAINST HATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. I rise today to express my sympathies and my condolences to the families of the many who have suffered from hate—more specifically, the families who have lost loved ones to hate.

The latest example that is being discussed quite widely now is what happened in Buffalo: 13 people wounded, the majority of them, the overwhelming majority, African Americans. Some were White.

But I express my sympathies and condolences to all persons who have family members who have suffered from hate violence. I do so because I understand that sympathies and condolences are important. People need to know that you care. But I also know, Madam Speaker, that sympathies and condolences are not enough.

It is not enough now to express our sorrow. It is important to express our sorrows, but it is not enough. Too many have died, and the truth is, this impacts all segments of society.

The African-American community had 9 people murdered on June 18, 2015, at the Charleston, South Carolina, church shooting.

The Asian community, 8 people murdered on March 16, 2021, at the Atlanta spa shooting.

The Jewish community, 11 people murdered on October 27, 2018, at the Pittsburgh Tree of Life synagogue shooting.

The Latino community, 22 people murdered on August 1, 2019, at the El Paso Walmart shooting.

The Muslim community, two people murdered on August 13, 2016, at the New York City mosque shooting.

The LGBTQ community, 49 people murdered on June 12, 2020, at the Pulse nightclub shooting.

This impacts all of our communities. All are at risk. The truth is, this continues because too many people in this country tolerate hate. Those who tolerate hate perpetuate hate.

Too many people tolerate hate. It is time for all to speak up.

If we are going to do something about this, we have to acknowledge something. The person who did this in the State of New York, Buffalo, this person has to be prosecuted to the fullest extent that the law allows, the fullest extent.

But we also have to understand something else as it relates to this person and the many others who have engaged in this kind of horrific activity, self-proclaimed white supremacists, persons who travel some great distance so they can find persons of African ancestry that are suitable for assassination. It happened in Texas at the Walmart. It happened in New York now at Buffalo, a person travels some 200 miles.

Saying that we care is important, but dealing with this hate is more important. We have to realize that for all of these people who performed these dastardly deeds that must be punished, we must realize that they were not born with this hate in their hearts. This is not expressing sympathy for them. This is understanding how it is we find ourselves having to mourn all of these persons who have been murdered, massacred, assassinated.

If we understand that they weren't born this way, then we have to ask ourselves: How did they become the dastards who would commit such heinous crimes?

I have in my hand something that is fairly succinct, something from a movie. I have the lyrics to the song, "You've Got to Be Taught."

You've got to be taught to hate and fear

You've got to be taught from year to year

It's got to be drummed into your dear little ear.

You've got to be carefully taught.

You've got to be taught to be afraid . . .

of people whose skin is a different shade

You've got to be carefully taught.

You've got to be taught

before it's too late

before you are six or

seven or eight

To hate all the people

your relatives hate

You've got to be carefully taught.

□ 1345

Each of these persons were taught—some at home from families who stated things in their presence that encouraged them to do these things.

Today, we have the problems of the internet and social media. Today, we have the ability for young people, with and without their parents' knowledge, to receive information, disinformation, fabrications, insidious prevarications, to receive this kind of horrible information online, with and without their parents knowing.

It appears that there is a theory now, the great replacement theory, the fear that immigrants are going to replace White Europeans. It appears this young man, this dastard in New York, the State of New York, city of Buffalo, that this person decided that this theory was enough to motivate him to commit these crimes.

We have to fight evil speech with our just speech. The speech that can counteract the evil messages that are being pervaded. We have to fight it with our speech. Everybody has a duty to stand up and speak out.

Those who tolerate bigotry, Islamophobia, xenophobia, sexism, racism, anti-Semitism, all of the various invidious phobias, those who tolerate these phobias, who tolerate people deciding that they will simply murder and massacre people, those who tolerate, perpetuate. And to a certain extent you become complicit.

As Dr. King put it, after some point of time, those who tolerate hate—these are not his exact words—it becomes betrayal. We have a duty to stand up and speak out. All people of good will.

Madam Speaker, I ask today: Where is the business community? These things are happening in places of business.

Where is the Chamber of Commerce? Where are the various Chambers of Commerce across this Nation? Why have they not spoken out?

These things are occurring in business places. At some point, people will limit their engagement in business places, if we don't stand up and speak out.

If people understand that there is a risk of being harmed for going into a food store or a service station, some place of business, people will limit their activities.

Someone might say, well, you can always order your food from a source and have it delivered to you. I contend that if you do this, or if you limit your participation, revenue will decline in places of business. The business community has to be concerned about its revenue.

Look, we should all be concerned about the lives that have been lost, but this can impact the economy. It can impact businesses and the extent that they will be able to maintain the workforce that they have. We have got to care about all of this. What impacts one directly can impact all indirectly. So we have got to concern ourselves with what is happening and how this can impact the economy.

So if we conclude that people are going to limit their access by going into places, choosing not to go, well, if this occurs, as I said, you might want to order your products from these business places. But here is the problem with that. That, too, will cause the revenue flow to be impacted in an adverse way.

Here is why. It is not unusual for someone—and I will use myself as an example—to go into a place of business